

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-11 have been amended. Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. The rejections are respectfully submitted to be obviated in view of the remarks presented herein.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly having a lack of antecedent basis. Applicants have amended claim 8 to change the dependency to be dependent upon claim 7. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are now respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) - Dodd

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Dodd (U.S. Patent Number 6,116,373). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding amended claim 1, the claimed invention relates to an attaching plate for attaching a speaker. The attaching plate comprises a hole in which the speaker is attached, and a cutout portion formed in a vicinity of the hole. The cutout portion suppresses a propagation of vibration generated by the speaker.

Dodd fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, the particularly claimed cutout portion, as recited by amended claim 1.

The claimed attaching plate comprises a hole and a cutout portion. A speaker is attached in the hole, and the cutout portion is “formed in a vicinity of the hole, the cutout portion suppressing a propagation of vibration generated by the speaker,” as claimed.

On the contrary, Dodd's slot (24) is formed on a side wall (12B) of a flared one piece horn body (10), as shown in Dodd's FIG. 1. Dodd's side wall (12B) of horn body (10) can not be an attaching plate for attaching a speaker. Instead, Dodd's side wall (12B) is a portion of the acoustic horn of a loudspeaker itself. Thus, Dodd fails to teach or suggest an attaching plate for attaching a speaker.

Furthermore, Dodd's slot (24) is formed for suppressing structural resonance of the flared one piece horn body (10) made of a metal material. The suppression of *structural resonance* fails to teach or suggest suppressing a propagation of vibration. The concept of internal structural resonance can not be translated to a vibration propagation, and as such, Dodd fails to teach or suggest a "cutout portion suppressing a propagation of vibration generated by the speaker," as recited by amended claim 1.

At least by virtue of the aforementioned differences, Applicants' claim 1 distinguishes over Dodd. Applicants' claims 2-10 are dependent claims including all of the elements of independent claim 1, which as established above, distinguishes over Dodd. Therefore, claims 2-10 are distinguished over Dodd for at least the aforementioned reasons as well as for their additionally recited features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) - Dodd in view of Bertolini et al.

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Dodd in view of Bertolini (U.S. Patent Number 6,226,927; hereinafter "Bertolini"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above regarding amended claim 1, Dodd fails to teach or suggest every element of the claimed invention. Bertolini does not remedy the deficiencies of Dodd.

The Examiner has referred to Bertolini only for the teaching of an automobile door which includes a wall (25) forming a cavity for a speaker (7) and covered by trim panel (8). Bertolini also fails to teach or suggest “a cutout portion formed in a vicinity of the hole, the cutout portion suppressing a propagation of vibration generated by the speaker,” as recited by amended claim 1.

Furthermore, because Dodd discloses only an acoustic horn body (10) of a loudspeaker, and Bertolini deals with an automobile vehicle door in which a speaker (7) is mounted, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to manipulate the side wall (12B) of Dodd’s horn body (10) of a loudspeaker when presented with the teaching of Bertolini’s inner trim panel (8) which attaches to the wall (25) of an automobile door in which a speaker (7) is enclosed. Thus, the references of Dodd and Bertolini are not combinable to achieve all the elements of the claimed invention.

Therefore, neither Dodd nor Bertolini, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the claimed invention as recited by amended claim 1. At least by virtue of the aforementioned differences, claim 1 is distinguished over Dodd in view of Bertolini. Claim 11 is a dependent claim including all of the elements of independent claim 1, and is also distinguished over Dodd in view of Bertolini for at least the aforementioned reasons as well as for its additionally recited features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
US Appln. No. 10/743,781
Attorney Docket No. Q79096

Art Unit No. 2837

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Lenny R. Jiang
Registration No. 52,432

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 23, 2006